

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/022,959	12/18/2001	John William Artley		7183		
75	590 06/23/2006		EXAMINER			
Steven L. Schmid			KHAN, AMINA S			
1257 Donald Sts, Suite 2 Jacksonville, FL 32205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			1751			
			DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	A	pplicant(s)		$\sim$
		10/022,959	A	ARTLEY ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	A	rt Unit		
		Amina Khan		751		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover s	heet with the con	espondence ac	ddress	
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ver to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS CON 36(a). In no event, however vill apply and will expire SI , cause the application to b	MMUNICATION.  er, may a reply be timely  K (6) MONTHS from the ecome ABANDONED (3)	filed mailing date of this of 35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 Ap</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	al matters, prose		e merits is	
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o					
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The specific and the spec	epted or b) object drawing(s) be held in ion is required if the	abeyance. See 3 drawing(s) is objec	7 CFR 1.85(a). ted to. See 37 C		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been receiv s have been receiv rity documents hav u (PCT Rule 17.2(a	ed. ed in Application e been received i)).	No	l Stage ·	
2) Notice 3) Information	ct(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) tr No(s)/Mail Date 12/18/2001.	5) <u> </u>	terview Summary (P aper No(s)/Mail Date. otice of Informal Pate ther:	· · ·	<sup>-</sup> O-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/022,959 Page 2

Art Unit: 1751

**DETAILED ACTION** 

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April

25, 2006 has been entered.

2. Claim 1 is pending. Claim 1 has been amended.

3. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) in view of Offord et al. (US

6,617,268) is withdrawn.

4. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the article

entitled "Multipurpose woven cotton and cotton/polyester blends containing crosslinked

polyols affixed by a low temperature cure" for the reasons set forth in the office action

dated December 23, 2005.

5. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the article

entitled "Improvement of various properties of fiber surfaces containing crosslinked

Art Unit: 1751

polyethylene glycols" for the reasons set forth in the office action dated December 23,

2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

States.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vigo et al.

(US 4,908,238).

Vigo et al. teaches treating cotton printcloth with polyethylene glycol, and a mixed

catalyst comprising magnesium chloride and citric acid, drying the fabric at 60°C curing

the fabric at 170°C, washing for 20 minutes at 50°C with running water and liquid

detergent prior to tumble drying (columns 15-16, example 23), wherein washing with

running water and detergent would inherently provide neutralization of the fabric. Vigo

et al. further teaches that the curing step may be conducted at lower temperatures such

as 100°C (column 5, lines 58-65), which meets the claimed limitation of a temperature

that does not exceed 220°F. Therefore, Vigo teaches substituting a lower temperature

of 100°C for the 170°C taught in the example. Furthermore, the examiner asserts that

"The fact remains that one of ordinary skill informed by the teachings would not have

had to choose judiciously from a genus of possible combinations to obtain the very

subject matter to which appellant's composition per se claims are directed." *In re Sivaramakrishnan, 213 USPQ 441 (CCPA 1982*).

Accordingly, the teachings of Vigo et al. anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vigo et al. (US 4,851,291).

Vigo et al. teaches treating cotton printcloth with polyethylene glycol, and a mixed catalyst comprising magnesium chloride and citric acid, drying the fabric at 60°C curing the fabric at 170°C, washing for 20 minutes at 50°C with running water and liquid detergent prior to tumble drying (column 16, example 23), wherein washing with running water and detergent would inherently provide neutralization of the fabric. Vigo et al. further teaches that the curing step may be conducted at lower temperatures such as 100°C (column 5, lines 58-65), which meets the claimed limitation of a temperature that does not exceed 220°F. Therefore, Vigo teaches substituting a lower temperature of 100°C for the 170°C taught in the example. Furthermore, the examiner asserts that "The fact remains that one of ordinary skill informed by the teachings would not have had to choose judiciously from a genus of possible combinations to obtain the very subject matter to which appellant's composition per se claims are directed." *In re Sivaramakrishnan, 213 USPQ 441 (CCPA 1982*).

Accordingly, the teachings of Vigo et al. anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1751

## Response to Arguments

9. The declarations under 37 CFR 1.132 filed April 25, 2006 are insufficient to overcome the rejections of claim 1 based upon the documents, "Multipurpose woven cotton and cotton/polyester blends containing crosslinked polyols affixed by a low temperature cure" and "Improvement of various properties of fiber surfaces containing crosslinked polyethylene glycols", as set forth in the last office action because: declarations under 37 CFR 1.132 are not sufficient to overcome 35 USC 102(b) rejections (see MPEP sections: 706.02(b) and 716). Therefore the rejections over these references are maintained.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amina Khan whose telephone number is (571) 272-5573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/022,959

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

amina h

Amina Khan Patent Examiner June 16, 2006

> Brian P. Mruk Brian P. Mruk Primary Evaminer

Page 6

TECH CENTER 1700